



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,160	06/25/2003	Albert Chungbor Wan	1033-T00517	3573
34456	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P. 5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265 AUSTIN, TX 78746			HO, CHUONG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,160

Applicant(s)

WAN ET AL.

Examiner

CHUONG T. HO

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 17 and 18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-16, 19-24 and 27-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7, 8, 25 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/12/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

1. Claims 1-34 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richardson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0125818 A1).

Regarding to claim 1, Richardson et al. discloses a broadcast overlay network (see figure 1, [0013] the ATM layer multicast delivery service enables a source to transmit ATM cells from a single point to multiple destinations (point-to-multipoint)) having a ring topology (100) to carry broadcast traffic from a head-end network (see figure 1, [0013], by implementing a multicast delivery service in a DSLAM at the head-end of a DSL network it is possible to make efficient use of network resources for the purpose of distributing audio, video and other information to the customer premise (CPE));

A digital subscriber line access multiplexer (DSLAM) ((9) see figure 1, 2) having a line interface (connecting CPE unit 2) and a network (connecting to ATM switch 10), the network interface in communication with the broadcast overlay network, the DSLAM, see figure 3, receive a request (media request from CPE) for a particular video channel

Art Unit: 2664

from a customer premise via the line interface, and to deliver the particular video channel from the network interface to the line interface (see figure 3) (see page 2, [0026], the customer premise equipment (CPE) sends a request of the network for multimedia program over an ATM signaling virtual circuit (1, FIG.3)...The Network Control System (NCS) sends a request to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer (DSLAM) for the CPE to join a multicast/point-to-multipoint) .

3. Regarding to claim 19, Richardson et al. discloses a broadcast overlay network (see figure 1, [0013] the ATM layer multicast delivery service enables a source to transmit ATM cells from a single point to multiple destinations (point-to-multipoint)) having a ring topology (100) to carry broadcast traffic from a head-end network (see figure 1, [0013], by implementing a multicast delivery service in a DSLAM at the head-end of a DSL network it is possible to make efficient use of network resources for the purpose of distributing audio, video and other information to the customer premise (CPE));

A digital subscriber line access multiplexer (DSLAM) ((9) see figure 1, 2) having a line interface (connecting CPE unit 2) and a network (connecting to ATM switch 10), the network interface in communication with the broadcast overlay network, the DSLAM, see figure 3, receive a request (media request from CPE) for a particular video channel from a customer premise via the line interface, and to deliver the particular video channel from the network interface to the line interface (see figure 3) (see page 2, [0026], the customer premise equipment (CPE) sends a request of the network for multimedia program over an ATM signaling virtual circuit (1, FIG.3)...The Network

Control System (NCS) sends a request to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer (DSLAM) for the CPE to join a multicast/point-to-multipoint).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0125818) in view of Hugenberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0140353 A1).

Regarding to claims 2, 20, Richardson et al. discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Richardson is silent to disclosing the broadcast overlay network comprises at least one synchronous optical network (SONET) ring.

Hugenberg et al. discloses wherein the broadcast overlay network comprises at least one synchronous optical network (SONET) ring (see figure 1, [0029], Programs that are broadcast from the video center are delivered over SONET multiplexers 60 to an Access System located in a central office. Within the Access System, a broadband digital terminal (BDT) 62 maintains service and subscriber entitlement information received from the Broadband entitlement manager located in the integrated operations center 64. The BDT also maintains a two-way signaling channel with each residential gateway (RG) 66 connected at each customer location within a designated service area.

Art Unit: 2664

This allows a RG to sign onto the network and to exchange channel change messages.

When an RG sends a channel change request to connect to a particular program stream, the BDT checks the entitlement information, and if entitled, delivers the appropriate MPEG 2 SPTS over AAL5/ATM to a corresponding broadband premises network. An optical network unit (ONU) 68 or DSLAM acts as a local service hub for connection of a cluster of customer residences).

Both Richardson, Hugenberg discloses headend and full service network for distribution video and audio programming. Hugenberg recognizes wherein the broadcast overlay network comprises at least one synchronous optical network (SONET) ring. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Hugenberg to provide wherein the broadcast overlay network comprises at least one synchronous optical network (SONET) ring in order to improve headend architecture for receiving and distributing programs from a number of content providers over a variety of transmission media.

5. In the claim 20, claim 20 is rejected the same reason of claim 2 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-4, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0125818) in view of Christin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,892,233 B1).

Regarding to claim 3, Richardson et al. discloses the limitations of claim 2 above.

However, Richardson et al. is silent to disclosing an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network.

Christin discloses an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network (see col. 7, lines 10-17, FIG. 1 is representation of an optical communication network 10. Generally, the optical communication system 10 has a SDH/SONET ring architecture 12 (or functional equivalent) that is accessed by a plurality of ingress and egress points, typically add-drop multiplexers 14-20. The ADMs may contain integral routers 22-24 (such as ADMs 16 and 20), although they may equally be of conventional design where a separate router 26 is coupled to the ADMs through a leased line 28. Local area networks (LANs) 30-34 are generally supported from the ADM or router, with peripheral devices 36-38 having access to the optical communication system 10).

Both Richardson, Christin discloses cable modem. Christin recognizes an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Christin to provide an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network in order to deliver the particular multimedia channel from network interface of the line interface.

7. Regarding to claim 21, Richardson et al. discloses the limitations of claim 2 above.

However, Richardson et al. is silent to disclosing an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network.

Christin discloses an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network (see col. 7, lines 10-17, FIG. 1 is representation of an optical communication network 10. Generally, the optical communication system 10 has a SDH/SONET ring architecture 12 (or functional equivalent) that is accessed by a plurality of ingress and egress points, typically add-drop multiplexers 14-20. The ADMs may contain integral routers 22-24 (such as ADMs 16 and 20), although they may equally be of conventional design where a separate router 26 is coupled to the ADMs through a leased line 28. Local area networks (LANs) 30-34 are generally supported from the ADM or router, with peripheral devices 36-38 having access to the optical communication system 10).

Both Richardson, Christin discloses cable modem. Christin recognizes an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Christin to provide an ingress ad-drop multiplexer to receive the broadcast traffic from the head-end network in order to deliver the particular multimedia channel from network interface of the line interface.

8. Regarding to claim 4, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2664

However, Richarson is silent to disclosing egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM.

Christin discloses egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM (see col. 7, lines 10-17).

Both Richarson, Christin discloses cable modem. Christin et al. recognizes egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richarson with the teaching of Christin to provide egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM in order to deliver the particular multimedia channel from network interface of the line interface.

9. Regarding to claim 22, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 2 above.

However, Richarson is silent to disclosing egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM.

Christin discloses egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM (see col. 7, lines 10-17).

Both Richarson, Christin discloses cable modem. Christin et al. recognizes egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the DSLAM.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richarson with the teaching of Christin to provide egress ADMs including an egress ADM connected to the network interface of the

Art Unit: 2664

DSLAM in order to deliver the particular multimedia channel from network interface of the line interface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Richardson – Christin) in view of Milbrandt (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0042433).

Regarding to claim 5, the combined system (Richardson – Christin) discloses the limitations of claim 4 above.

However, the combined system (Richardson – Christin) is silent to disclosing a plurality of SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element.

Mibrandt discloses plurality of SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element (111) (see figure 1).

Both Richardson, Christin, and Mibrandt disclose digital subscriber line head-end. Mibrandt recognizes SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element (111) (see figure 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system (Richardson – Christin) with the teaching of Mibrandt to provide SONET rings connected by a least

Art Unit: 2664

one cross connect element deliver the particular multimedia channel from network interface of the line interface.

11. Regarding to claim 23, the combined system (Richardson – Christin) discloses the limitations of claim 4 above.

However, the combined system (Richardson – Christin) is silent to disclosing a plurality of SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element.

Mibrandt discloses plurality of SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element (111) (see figure 1).

Both Richardson, Christin, and Mibrandt disclose digital subscriber line head-end. Mibrandt recognizes SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element (111) (see figure 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system (Richardson – Christin) with the teaching of Mibrandt to provide SONET rings connected by a least one cross connect element deliver the particular multimedia channel from network interface of the line interface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2664

12. Claims 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 24, 27, 28, 29, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0125818 A1) in view of Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0117503 A1).

Regarding to claim 6, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Richardson et al. is silent to disclosing an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message.

Nguyen et al. discloses an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message (see page 1, [0003]).

Both Richardson, Nguyen discloses the DSLAM. Nguyen recognizes an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Nguyen to provide an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message in order to provide channel changing functionality under bandwidth limited conditions.

13. Regarding to claim 24, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Richardson et al. is silent to disclosing an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message.

Nguyen et al. discloses an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message (see page 1, [0003]).

Both Richardson, Nguyen discloses the DSLAM. Nguyen recognizes an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

Art Unit: 2664

system of Richardson with the teaching of Nguyen to provide an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message in order to provide channel changing functionality under bandwidth limited conditions.

14. Regarding to claim 9, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Richardson is silent to disclosing the broadcast traffic comprises Internet Protocol (IP) multicast envelops

Nguyen discloses the broadcast traffic comprises Internet Protocol (IP) multicast envelops (see page 2, [0020]).

Both Richardson, Nguyen discloses the DSLAM. Nguyen recognizes an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Nguyen to provide Both Richardson, Nguyen discloses the DSLAM. Nguyen recognizes an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Nguyen to provide an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message in order to provide channel changing functionality under bandwidth limited conditions. in order to provide channel changing functionality under bandwidth limited conditions.

15. Regarding to claim 27, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Richardson is silent to disclosing the broadcast traffic comprises Internet Protocol (IP) multicast envelops

Art Unit: 2664

Nguyen discloses the broadcast traffic comprises Internet Protocol (IP) multicast envelopes (see page 2, [0020]).

Both Richardson, Nguyen discloses the DSLAM. Nguyen recognizes an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Nguyen to provide Both Richardson, Nguyen discloses the DSLAM. Nguyen recognizes an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Nguyen to provide an Internet group management protocol (IGMP) request message in order to provide channel changing functionality under bandwidth limited conditions. in order to provide channel changing functionality under bandwidth limited conditions.

16. Regarding to claim 10, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is further to receive, from the customer premise via the line interface, a unicast request (see figure 3) for a destination in the head-end network, and to deliver the unicast request to a dedicated data network separate from broadcast overlay network and separate from a legacy xDSL data network (see page 3 [0026]).

17. Regarding to claim 28, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is further to receive, from the customer premise via the line interface, a unicast request (see figure 3) for a destination in the head-end network, and to deliver the unicast request to a dedicated data network separate from broadcast overlay network and separate from a legacy xDSL data network (see page 3 [0026]).

Art Unit: 2664

18. Regarding to claim 11, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is further to receive, from the customer premise via the line interface, a unicast request for a destination in the head-end network, and to deliver the unicast request to a dedicated data network separate from the broadcast overlay network and separate from a legacy xDSL data network (see page 3, [0026]).

19. Regarding to claims 13, 31, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is further to receive, from the customer premise via the line interface, a unicast request for a destination in the head-end network, and to deliver the unicast request to one of a legacy xDSL data and a dedicated data network base on a policy decision (a connection profile) (see page 2, [0024]), the dedicated data network separate from the broadcast overly network and the legacy xDSL data network (see page 1, [0014]).

20. Regarding to claim 31, claim 31 is rejected the same reason of claim 13 above.

21. Regarding to claim 29, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is further to receive, from the customer premise via the line interface, a unicast request for a destination in the head-end network, and to deliver the unicast request to one of a legacy xDSL data and a dedicated data network base on a policy decision (a connection profile) (see page 2, [0024]), the dedicated data network separate from the broadcast overly network and the legacy xDSL data network (see page 1, [0014]).

22. Regarding to claims 14, 32, see figure 3, Richardson et al. the DSLAM is to receive, from the head-end network, unicast traffic whose intended destination is the customer premise, and to direct the unicast traffic to the customer premise via the line interface (see figure 1, page 1, [0014]).

Art Unit: 2664

23. Regarding to claim 32, claim 32 is rejected the same reason of claim 14 above.
24. Regarding to claims 15, 33, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is to receive the unicast traffic via a legacy xDSL data network (see figure 3).
25. Regarding to claim 33, claim 33 is rejected the same reason of claim 15 above.
26. Regarding to claims 16, 34, see figure 3, Richardson et al. discloses the DSLAM is to receive the unicast traffic via a dedicated data network separate from the broadcast overlay network and separate from a legacy xDSL data network (see figure 1, page 1, [0014]).
27. Regarding to claim 34, the claim 34 is rejected the same reason of claim 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claims 12, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (2004/0125818 A1) in view of Son et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0026645 A1).

Regarding to claims 12, 30, Richardson discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, Richardson is silent to disclosing data network comprises a virtual private network (VPN).

Son et al. discloses data network comprises a virtual private network (VPN) (see page 2, [0024]).

Both Richardson and Son discloses the headend, DSLAM. Son recognizes data network comprises a virtual private network (VPN). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Richardson with the teaching of Son to provide data network comprises a virtual private network (VPN) in order to distributing video content to a subscriber terminal that is coupled to the access network..

Allowable Subject Matter

30. Claims 17-18 are allowed.

31. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art (20040125818, 20030140353, 6892233, 20040042433, 20040117503, 20020026645) of does not appear to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations in combination with the specific added limitations, as recited from independent claim 17: "the DSLAM to receive an Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) request message for a particular video channel from a customer premise via the line interface, to determine an available of the particular video channel based on at least one of a group address and a class-D Internet Protocol (IP) address provided by the IGMP request and to deliver the particular video channel from the network interface to the line interface".

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

Art Unit: 2664

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

32. Claims 7, 8, 25, 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUONG T. HO whose telephone number is (571) 272-3133. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

11/26/05


WELLINGTON CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER